

REMARKS:

Claim Election:

Applicants hereby confirm election of claims 1-28 without traverse. Claim 30 has been canceled. Applicants hereby request rejoinder of claim 29 upon allowance of parent claim 1, and the opportunity to rejoin claims 31-35 as dependent claims from claim 15 upon allowance.

Claims 1-8, 13-22 and 27-28

Claims 1-8, 13-22 and 27-28 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breyta et al. (US2001/0005741) in view of Whewell et al. (US5017271).

The analysis of obviousness was set forth in *Graham v. John Deere*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966). In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met:

First, there must be some *suggestion or motivation*, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the teachings of the references. Second, there must be a *reasonable expectation of success*. Finally, the prior art reference or combined references must teach or suggest *all the claim limitations*. *The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art*, and not based on applicant's disclosure (*In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991; emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-8, 13-22 and 27-28 as failing the *Graham* test. Specifically, regarding claim 1 and its dependents, the combination proposed in the rejection fails the first element of the *Graham* test. Regarding claim 15 and its dependents, the rejection fails the first and third elements of the *Graham* test.

Regarding claims 1-8, 13-22 and 27-28, Applicants respectfully disagree that there is suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of Breyta with Whewell.

HIT1P023/HSJ920030085US1

Particularly, Whewell teaches away from plating using an underlayer. A *prima facie* case of obviousness may be rebutted by showing that the art, in any material respect, teaches away from the claimed invention. *In re Geisler*, 116 F.3d 1465, 1471, 43 USPQ2d 1362, 1366 (Fed. Cir. 1997). It is improper to combine references where the references teach away from their combination. *In re Grasselli*, 713 F.2d 731, 743, 218 USPQ 769, 779 (Fed. Cir. 1983). The claimed invention requires coating a substrate with a barrier layer, and coating the barrier layer with a top layer comprising a photoresist. In sharp contrast, Whewell states that “[t]he present invention also eliminates the need for a pre-treatment of the metallic surfaces prior to the application of the photoresist, and allows for better resolution in the photo imaging process.” See Whewell col. 3, lines 26-30. Whewell clearly indicates that a pre-treatment is not necessary.

Whewell goes on to indicate that such a pretreatment is undesirable, thereby teaching away from the claimed invention. As shown in Breyta’s FIGS. 2-3 and 6-7, an undercut is formed as part of the photoresist patterning process. Referring next to Whewell col. 2, lines 26-34, formation of an undercut under the photoresist results in conductive lines that are curved inwardly. This in turn adversely affects the minimum size possible for manufacturing conductive lines. Accordingly, Whewell’s invention “eliminates the need for a pre-treatment of the metallic surfaces prior to the application of the photoresist, and allows for better resolution in the photo imaging process.” See Whewell col. 3, lines 26-31. It is clear that Whewell teaches away from plating in a process as taught by Breyta, as to do so would result in poor definition of the conductive lines that are so critical to Whewell’s invention. Applying the rules of *In re Geisler*, and *In re Grasselli*, because Whewell not only teaches away from masking processes using an underlayer and undercut, but actually makes such an object of his invention, it is clear that Whewell teaches away from combination with Breyta. It is improper to combine references where the references teach away from their combination. *In re Grasselli*. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-8, 13-22 and 27-28 is respectfully requested.

Further, the mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Although a prior art device “may be capable of being modified to run the way the apparatus is claimed, there must be a suggestion or motivation in the reference to do so.” 916 F.2d at 682, 16 USPQ2d at 1432.). As noted in the Office Action, Breyta does not mention plating. As noted above, Whewell indicates that plating in conjunction with a mask having an undercut is undesirable. Therefore, it cannot be said that the prior art suggests the desirability of the combination, as required by *In re Mills*.

For any of the foregoing reasons, the rejection fails the first prong of the *Graham* test. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-8, 13-22 and 27-28 is respectfully requested.

Regarding claims 15-22 and 27-28, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as failing the third prong of the *Graham* test. Particularly, nowhere does Breyta or the remaining art of record disclose or suggest the unique polyphenolic polymer having the claimed repeating monomeric units. In an interview between the Examiner and the undersigned, the Examiner conceded that the Breyta fails to disclose the monomeric unit in the claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 13-22 and 27-28 is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-11 and 23-25

Claims 9-11 and 23-25 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breyta et al. in view of Whewell and further in view of Lee (US6866987).

Regarding claims 9-11 and 23-25, Applicants have shown that the parent claims 1 and 15, respectively, are allowable over the combination of Breyta and Whewell. Accordingly, the rejection based on Breyta, Whewell and Lee suffers from the same deficiencies, and therefore is improper.

Regardless, Applicants also respectfully assert that the combination proposed in the rejection fails the third prong of the *Graham* test. Particularly, regarding claim 9, Lee has been added to show that the developer does not remove the exposed portion of the barrier layer. Applicants respectfully disagree. Referring to Lee FIG. 2 and related description at col. 3, lines 28-64 (cited in part in the rejection), it is clear that the underlayer 25 is in fact removed with the photoresist layer 12 after exposure. As shown, after exposure, the photoresist layer 12 and underlayer 25 are removed. Note with particularity Lee col. 3, lines 42-45, which states that "Layers 25 and 12 together form a bilayer which is treated as a single layer for purposes of exposure to radiation and subsequent development." Then, as noted at Lee col. 3, lines 54-56, etching of the underlayer 25 is allowed to continue to create an undercut, as shown in Lee FIG. 4. Accordingly, Lee does not teach or suggest that the underlayer 25 remains after radiation and development. For this reason as well, the rejection fails the *Graham* test. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Regarding claims 10-11, Applicants also respectfully disagree that Lee teaches or suggests removal of underlayer 25. Particularly, as mentioned immediately above, the underlayer 25 is removed as part of the developing process. Further, referring to Lee col. 4, lines 9-15 (cited in the rejection), Applicants note that this section refers to using the remaining photoresist 12 as a mask for etching and milling of a substrate 22, as shown in FIG. 4 (prior to milling or etching) and FIGS. 5-6 (after milling or etching). Accordingly, Lee does not teach or suggest that the underlayer 25 is removed by milling or etching. Thus, the rejection fails the *Graham* test. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 10-11 is respectfully requested.

Claims 12 and 26

Claims 12 and 26 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breyta et al. in view of Whewell and further in view of Pinarbasi (US6218056).

Applicants have shown that the parent claims 1 and 15, respectively, are allowable over the combination of Breyta and Whewell. Accordingly, the rejection

based on Breyta, Whewell and Pinarbasi suffers from the same deficiencies, and therefore is improper.

Regardless, Applicants also respectfully assert that the combination proposed in the rejection fails the third prong of the *Graham* test. Claim 12 requires that no undercuts are created under the photoresist. While Pinarbasi indicates that the length of the undercut can be controlled by varying the amount of time the weak developer is left in place, Pinarbasi does indeed indicate that an undercut is present. First, by stating that the length of the undercut is controllable, he implies that an undercut is present. Second, Pinarbasi FIG. 12 shows an undercut. Nowhere does Pinarbasi suggest that no undercut is present. Thus, the rejection fails the *Graham* test. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 12 is respectfully requested.

Claim 36

Claim 36 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breyta et al. in view of Whewell and further in view of Hawkins (US5006202).

Applicants have shown that claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Breyta and Whewell. Claim 36 contains limitations similar to claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 36 based on Breyta, Whewell and Hawkins suffers from the same deficiencies as the rejection of claim 1, and therefore is improper.

Applicants also argue that Whewell teaches away from its combination with Hawkins, thereby negating a prima facie case of obviousness per the rule of *In re Grasselli*. It is improper to combine references where the references teach away from their combination. *In re Grasselli*. Again, Whewell states that “[t]he present invention also eliminates the need for a pre-treatment of the metallic surfaces prior to the application of the photoresist, and allows for better resolution in the photo imaging process.” See Whewell col. 3, lines 26-30. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 36 is respectfully requested.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 971-2573. For payment

of any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2587 (Order No. HSJ920030085US1).

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Dominic M. Kotab/ Date: July 17, 2006
Dominic M. Kotab
Reg. No. 42,762

Zilka-Kotab, PC
P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, California 95172-1120
Telephone: (408) 971-2573
Facsimile: (408) 971-4660